

The Virginia Indigent Defense Commission
Commission Meeting
1604 Santa Rosa Road, Suite 200
Richmond VA 23229
June 6, 2013

Judge Alan Rosenblatt (ret.) called the meeting to order at 11:10am. Other Commission members in attendance were Maria Jankowski, Kristen Howard, David Lett, Karl Hade, Carmen Williams, Judge Hanson, David Walker, and John Douglass. Administrative staff included Executive Director, David Johnson; Deputy Director, DJ Geiger; and Administrative Assistant, Diane Pearson.

Quorum requirements have been met.

Mr. Walker said he did not attend the last Commission meeting but in reading the minutes he noticed there was a discussion on professionalism and getting clients to tell the truth. He said the point he wants to make is that it seems we ought to be teaching our Public Defenders to learn about their case before they talk to their client. When you tell the client about their case you have a better chance of the client being honest with you. He is hoping we will train our attorneys to learn about their cases before they talk to their clients.

Mr. Johnson said that this will be discussed during the training overview later in the meeting. The newer lawyers are being trained on exactly that.

The first order of business is to approve today's agenda and minutes from the March meeting.

Mr. Walker made a motion approving the agenda and minutes. Judge Hanson seconded the motion. The motion carried.

The next item on the agenda is organizational items.

Judge Rosenblatt said that in the past the Executive committee has met and presented a slate of officers to elect the Chair and Vice Chair. We have decided to open the floor to nominations during the full Commission meeting for these two positions.

Mr. Johnson said currently Judge Rosenblatt is Chair and Maria Jankowski is Vice Chair and both have indicated a willingness to serve again.

Mr. Walker made a motion to reelect Judge Rosenblatt as Chairman and reelect Maria Jankowski as Vice Chairman. Judge Hanson seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Ms. Geiger said that the current list of committee members is in the meeting materials. There is a vacancy; Kent Smith gave his resignation from the Commission in March. The Governor's office is behind on appointments, so we do not currently have a new appointee. Kent was on the Policy and Procedure Committee so when that vacancy is filled, the new member will serve on that committee.

There was discussion regarding the current committee membership assignments.

Mr. Walker made a motion to approve the committee structure as proposed. Judge Hanson seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Ms. Geiger said that each year we review the delegated authority of the committees. A copy of the proposed authority is in the materials. The Commission approves the authority of the committees as well as the committee memberships each year.

Previously a reference to the authority of the Executive Director was in there but it is not relevant to the committee authority so we are proposing to remove that language.

Within that same paragraph from the sentence that reads: "The continuation and authority of the Standing Committees and recommendations for membership of each shall be reviewed annually," we removed "proposed to the full Commission by the Executive Committee". Previously we had taken this through the Executive Committee and had them make the recommendations and then propose it to the full Commission, but it seems to be more efficient to have the full Commission approve the committee recommendations.

The third proposal relates to the recommendations of committees. Generally when a committee meets, they make recommendations to the full Commission. Even though we have not had much need for it, the committees are not given authority to just act. We thought it might be good to clean up the language, to allow you to specifically delegate that authority to a Committee in the event that immediate action is needed. When specific authority is so delegated a committee would have the authority to act if necessary rather than to bring it to the full Commission.

Judge Hanson made a motion approving the changes to the authority of committees. Ms. Williams seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Mr. Johnson said that by law all state agencies are required to acknowledge that the agency carries no debt and there is a form in the meeting materials, Appendix A, Deficit Provision Acknowledgment Form, the Executive Director is required to sign every year. We are also required to inform the Commission members that the agency carries no debt.

Ms. Geiger said the IT sole source exception is an IT/Procurement issue. We reported to the Commission previously that the state issued a new Request for Proposal (RFP) for hosting and development of IT services; websites or any applications that have been developed specifically for an agency. The contract was previously held by a company called Virginia Interactive (VI). Under the contract, VI developed and hosted our website, authentication, and access portal, and the attorney certification system which is what private attorneys and public defenders use to certify and recertify and that we use to track and house that database.

They also developed, and are in the process of converting and updating, the new version of our case management system which takes the system from server driven to web driven. We are not quite finished with that conversion.

Virginia Information Technology Agency (VITA) is looking to move all agencies from the old contract to new vendors. They want to do that this month. The move either requires that the new vendors receive from VI and learn the source code VI wrote, or that the new vendor develop its own source code, applications, or programs for us, convert our old programs to the new and populate the new with all of our data. We do not believe we are in a position to move everything this month. We just received the new copiers and are in the process of getting them installed, plus we are installing all new desktops and laptops throughout the agency. This is all taking place this month and the beginning of next month.

We have not completed the case management system conversion and are in the middle of an IT security audit of the attorney certification system. We have four IT positions allocated and are down to three because one person recently left. We believe we may have follow up items to the attorney certification (ACeS) audit. We may have modifications to the new case management system once we get that up and running. We already discovered a few things that need to be fixed.

To ensure we have the time and resources necessary to pay for and manage the migration of all our systems to the new vendors with the least amount of disruption to the public defender offices, we think we need to keep using Virginia Interactive for these services right now. To accomplish that, we are asking that the Commission give the Executive Director authority to sign what is called a Sole Source Exception. In state procurement, a Sole Source Exception can be used when you adequately show a particular vendor is the only practical source available. Given all of the items we just went over, we believe this is our only option at this point.

Mr. Walker made a motion to utilize the Sole Source Exception for current VI hosted services. Professor Douglass seconded the motion. The motion carried.

The next item on the agenda is the budget update.

Ms. Geiger said that she would like to recognize Amber Brown, who is our Financial Services Manager. Amber put the proposed FY14 budget together. She has learned quickly where to get the numbers and who to call. She brings a great approach to developing our budget. She has been assisted by Jewell Hudson, who is our Budget and Finance Director. Jewell has been with the state for many years with various agencies including the Department of Planning and Budget and the Department of Accounts. Ms. Geiger thanked both of them for making this much easier than it had been for years.

Ms. Geiger said that we are on track with expenditures for FY13. There are four months of expenditures listed so we are able to see how our expenses are tracking. Not reflected in there are bills coming due in the next couple of weeks and items we paid in May.

The second item in the budget update is turnover and vacancy. Each year we project what savings we will have when a position becomes vacant until it is filled. The salary not being paid generates savings for the agency. We have been using that to pay for other things as they come up.

For several years our agency generated over \$1 million in turnover and vacancy. Because we did not generate quite as much as we predicted in FY12, for FY13 we reduced our expectations and estimated a generation of \$744,000 in turnover and vacancy savings. Looking at the actual savings so far through the month of April payrolls, we have generated about 54 percent of the estimated amount. Based on the actual amount of savings realized in FYs12 and 13, for FY14 we are reducing our expectations even more, to about \$390,000. The good news about low turnover is that we are getting very good applicants for the positions, people are staying longer, and that means our clients are likely getting a better quality of representation, but it is limiting the savings that we used to have to pay for some other things.

The current projection is that we should finish the fiscal year with about \$120,000. We will be paying for the computer refresh, the copiers, and all of the usual year end bills that will be coming due.

There were several factors that affected our projected year end balance for this fiscal year. First, we prepaid three months rent last year, lowering our FY13 rent obligation. Second, we received back most of our year end savings from FY12. We finished with a balance of about \$260,000 and received back all but \$38,000 from the General Assembly. Third, for the payment of the bonuses, when the central agency made an adjustment to our appropriation in order to pay the bonuses, we received more to cover the bonuses than we needed. Without these three factors, the \$123,000 wouldn't be \$123,000; we would not have had funds to purchase the copiers. The \$123,000 is more than it could have been.

That was the update for FY13 and where we think we are going to land for FY13.

We have a judicial reversion of \$200,000 next year (FY14). Meaning we have to return that amount.

The next item on the agenda is the FY14 update.

The first page is by agency and is an overall look by object codes.

Sub-object codes 1123 and 1124 are personnel costs. Sub-object code 1123 is salaries of classified employees. This category should have the salary costs of employees that are subject to the personnel act. We do not have any of those. Years ago we put part-time salaries in there to keep track of part-time employee salaries. However, part time salaries do not belong in this sub-object code, so we moved it to 1124. That is why 1123 drops to zero and 1124 is higher.

In sub-object code 1195, turnover and vacancy, we reduced the anticipated amount of turnover and vacancy anticipation to \$393,852.

Last year when putting the budget together, we knew we were going to have some savings from the prepayment of rent, and we knew we were going to have some turnover and vacancy savings. We allocated those savings directly into the proposed budget. This means we allocated more than the total appropriation amount we received from the General Assembly. For budgeting purposes this looks wrong because it looks like we are going to spend more than we have. This year, we took the approach that we are only going to appropriate what we have been given, and we will look at what we cannot fund and ask the Commission to approve that subject to anticipated savings as realized.

There was discussion regarding the budget.

Mr. Johnson said that we know there will be money left over and there are things that we want to address one at a time with that money. We want the authority to pay those items.

Ms. Geiger said that the next chart in the materials contains the proposed budget allocated by Service Area which is broken down for Public Defender Offices, Capital Defender Offices, Regulatory, and Administration. The next chart in the materials is the same information allocated by Cost Code, or each individual office. The administration cost codes are broken down into Training Administration, Certification, Commission, and Non Certification, IT and Administrative.

The budget does not include the costs of the two percent state employee raise because the Department of Planning and Budget will make an adjustment to the appropriations of the agencies to cover the amount of the raise. We are not appropriating it because we do not have it yet, and they will make an adjustment for us when that happens.

We propose prepaying two months rent for FY14 in this fiscal year. That creates a savings of \$390,000 in FY14. We are projecting turnover and vacancy savings at one percent of the salaries or \$393,000. Anticipated rent and turnover and vacancy savings would total approximately \$792,000.

There are two lists. The first list, we would like the Commission to approve for payment to include:

1. \$200,000 for the required FY14 Judicial Reversion contained in the Appropriations Act.
2. \$ 24,000 for the estimated costs of continuing with VI as the vendor for our Case Management System, ACeS, our website, and the access and authentication portal under an IT Sole Source Exception for one year.
3. \$ 35,000 for the required IT Security Audit of the new case management system which required the review of years of data for each individual office, as well as the conversion process from the old case management system to the new.

The second list we would like the Commission to approve for contingent payment based on availability of funds:

- \$ 55,000 Case Management System fixes and further development
- \$ 48,500 General operational IT costs. When we were allocating funds, several IT

items were not included because we ran out of funds.

\$ 16,000 Phone system for Alexandria PD office if needed. Currently the City has advised that the office can continue to use the City provided phones. If that changes, we will need to purchase a phone system.

The total for the proposed and contingent lists is \$378,500 with the \$792,000 in anticipated savings. That leaves us about \$400,000 for emergencies or other items that may cost more than we anticipate or if our turnover is less than we imagined. It would leave us a buffer.

Within the budget itself and within the cost codes that are already proposed there are two personnel items we wanted to make the Commission aware of. Previously the Virginia Information Technology Agency (VITA) required us to assign an Information Security Officer (ISO) for the agency. This person cannot be in the IT Department, so Ms. Geiger was designated to perform this task. She has been able to perform the duties, but now they are moving toward a requirement that the ISO be a person who is certified and who can meet the more technical IT security requirements.

We looked at this and believe that the ISO position as described is not a full time job for our agency. We are proposing for approval for an hourly part time ISO position for up to twenty hours per week at \$45 per hour.

Mr. Johnson added that for this to be a full time position, it would cost a six figure salary, and we cannot justify that, so this was another way to meet the need.

Ms. Geiger said that when Carlos Hopkins was with the agency he oversaw Training, Certification and the Standards of Practice Enforcement. When he left, we split the position, and we now have a Standards of Practice Attorney who is handling the enforcement and certification responsibilities and have split out training completely. Our HR Director has taken over the logistical parts of training. The Senior Appellate Coordinator, the Standards of Practice Enforcement Attorney, and the Legal Resources Attorney positions are all helping with the substantive training items. We had initially created a Training Manager position, but at this point we are not convinced we need that position because we have the logistics and the substance handled. The part time hourly ISO position would be paid out of some of the funds that were allocated for the Training Manager position.

We are not asking for additional money but it would be a different position that would be permanent. We are asking to change part of that position.

The Franklin Public Defender Office had a part-time APD I position. Based on the caseload of that office, the PD believes he does not need that position. He has asked that we reallocate the position.

There are several offices that do not have a sentencing advocate position, so the proposal is that the half time APD I position be reallocated from Franklin to Winchester and be reclassified as a part time Sentencing Advocate I position.

Winchester is the largest office without a Sentencing Advocate position. This will be a step toward the goal of having at least a part time Sentencing Advocate position in every office.

There is a two percent raise that is being provided to state employees. Within the Appropriations Act, the Executive Branch is being directed to raise the pay band levels simultaneous with the two percent raise. We would like to request within this budget that the Commission similarly raise our entry levels by two percent so we can continue to move the starting salaries as the Executive Branch moves its pay bands.

Mr. Johnson said that they are giving us the money to do this and the Executive Branch of the state is doing this, so it makes sense.

Ms. Geiger said that every employee who has been with the state for five years or longer will receive an additional \$65 per year of service added to his or her base salary.

There was discussion regarding the budget, the contingent items, and the possibility of a hiring delay in the event that things are worse than anticipated.

The discussion continued with questions regarding the two percent raise, the \$65 per year of service and current salaries.

Ms. Geiger said in summary, the proposed FY14 budget would include the proposed and contingent items as discussed and provided in the meeting materials that would be paid out of turnover and vacancy savings and rent savings; the transition of part of the training manager position to an hourly ISO position; reallocation of a part time APD I from the Franklin Public Defender Office to a part time Sentencing Advocate position in the Winchester Public Defender Office, and raising entry level salaries by two percent in conjunction with the state employee raise.

Judge Hanson moved to approve the proposed budget. Mr. Walker seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Professor Douglass had a question about the \$200,000 budget cut; he thought it was \$2 million.

Ms. Geiger explained that our budget was cut \$200,000. Last year we had money added in for bonuses and that is reflected in the \$45 million. We also appropriated all of the savings that we had from the prepayment of three months rent. The appropriation is the \$42,961 and that is what it was before.

Ms. Geiger said that every September, without much notice or time to respond, the Fiscal Department receives a request for submission of a decision package. A decision package is a proposal to modify the current agency base budget or to change any language in the Appropriations Act. For four or five years we have not submitted a decision package. She asked the Commission if they would want to continue that or consider adding something to the decision package.

If the Commission would like to submit a decision package, because of the limited time for submission and the fact that the next Commission meeting is not until later in September and would likely be after the due date, we would need a delegation of authority to the Budget Committee to meet and act on a decision package.

The Commission opted to not do anything at this time.

The next item on the agenda is the legislative update.

Ms. Geiger said in the meeting materials there is a copy of a press release sent out by the Supreme Court Clerk asking for comment on the proposed amendments to the Discovery Rules. We have had quite a bit of discussion on this and have supported the proposed changes. There is a copy of a draft proposed letter in the materials. She thanked and credited Professor Douglass, because ninety percent of the letter is his language. The letter, if approved, will be signed by Mr. Johnson and Judge Rosenblatt.

Comments are due to the Court before July 1st.

Mr. Walker made a motion approving sending the proposed letter as the Commission's comment on the proposed amendments. Judge Hanson seconded the motion. The motion carried with Ms. Howard and Mr. Hade abstaining.

There was discussion regarding Discovery Rule 3A.

Mr. Johnson said that the next item is just to keep the Commission posted on a project that has been going on for the last year. The VCJC (Virginia Criminal Justice Conference) had written to us, the Virginia Supreme Court, and the Virginia State Bar asking us to review the qualification standards for and the appointment process involved in capital murder cases. The letter outlined several concerns, some of which involved the standards predating the creation of our capital offices that hadn't been looked at in a while.

In conjunction with the Supreme Court and the State Bar, we formed a fifteen member study committee that was broken down into four subcommittees. We are at the point where the subcommittee reports are in and approved by the committee. We just drafted an executive summary for circulation and will have a final version in the next month.

The VCJC has their annual meeting in September. Mr. Johnson is on the VCJC, and he will be there along with several public defenders. Mr. Johnson will volunteer to present the recommendations to the VCJC at that point. There is only one minor legislative change proposed, and our hope would be that the VCJC, or perhaps the Court, would champion that. It is nothing controversial. Basically the existing standards focus almost primarily on experience without taking a look at if the person is any good. Another irony is that in order to be certified to be hired to handle a misdemeanor case in Virginia you have to go through specified training. In order to handle a capital murder case currently there is no initial training requirement. Those are things proposed to be rectified.

Where it may impact us is the training at every level of certification for handling capital cases, including: co-counsel, lead counsel, appellate, and habeas counsel. Significant training is proposed and we would be looked at as a partner in providing that training.

Mr. Johnson said that the way the statute is set up it empowers the Court and the Indigent Defense Commission, in conjunction with the State Bar, to set the qualification standards for capital representation. So we have the authority to say “you have to do this or that”. Just like getting qualified to do felonies or misdemeanors there is going to be a waiver process for the person who should be on the list but for anyone else who wants to get on the list, there are going to be significant capital specific training requirements.

There was discussion regarding the court appointed list.

Mr. Johnson said that we cannot tell them who to appoint from the list, but we can provide them with the list. Everyone is going to be required to become certified. They can either apply for a waiver, which is going to be tough to meet, or they are going to have to go through the training. Mr. Johnson expects that there will be many people dropping off the list.

There was discussion regarding the court appointed list for capital murder cases.

Mr. Johnson said that details are still being worked out but there is going to be a certification process. There was a question as to whether or not we are going to have committees, and we are empowered to put together a committee of practitioners to review the certification process.

In the federal system when a judge makes an appointment he is required to consult or seek the recommendation of the capital defender office, but does not have to take this advice.

Ms. Geiger said that in this past General Assembly Session (2013) there was a budget amendment that initially proposed to cut \$500,000 out of our budget and twelve positions, specifically from the capital defender offices, which would have been more than a third of the positions in those offices. What ended up coming out of the Session was a judicial reversion of \$200,000, which we have already covered in the budget discussion.

Additionally, there was language in the Appropriations Act that instructs us to review the current organizational structure and workload of the capital defense units, develop a plan to restructure the offices based on current and projected workload, and reallocate positions as may be appropriate to public defender offices with the greatest caseloads with relation to their staffing.

Since we do not have a lot of money to hire someone to do this study for us, we talked with Dick Hickman at Senate Finance, because the budget amendment came from the senate, and asked him what they are envisioning and what the extent of this review needs to be. He told us he would leave it to us, that we are the experts and said they would be likely to come back and ask us for the results and what we did.

Ms. Geiger met with Senator Ryan McDougle, who was the patron of the initial version of the budget amendment. His opinion was that the state budget is going to get worse, and his approach is that all agencies are being looked at. He pointed to DJJ (Department of Juvenile Justice) which got cut over \$1 million this year. He lost positions in his district; no one is immune.

He said if we do the review and if the data is not what they understand it to be, they will take another look but did not seem convinced.

Dick Hickman advised that he received information from the Sentencing Commission. Ms. Geiger contacted the Sentencing Commission and obtained the data given to Mr. Hickman. The data provided looked at the number of convictions for capital murder over several years. The data included whether the conviction was death or life, and the number of death penalty sentences imposed has been greatly reduced as have the overall convictions for capital murder. That is the data they based it on.

Mr. Johnson said that because our capital offices are doing such a good job and a lot of these are being resolved as first degree, they were not capturing those at all.

Ms. Geiger said that the Sentencing Commission thought there were other factors affecting the decrease in the number of capital convictions.

Ms. Geiger contacted the Court and was able to get a good spreadsheet of data because they have just worked on the caseload study. We are going to look at this data and provide the Commission with a report during the September Commission meeting. The General Assembly will want to know what we did.

Ms. Geiger said that Senator McDougle is not a fan of our system. He believes that some of the jurisdictions do a very good job with the court appointed lists and the court appointed attorneys do a very good job so it is an uphill battle. He said he does not think the system is needed, that we could do it with the court appointed attorneys. He did concede that some localities were better suited for public defender offices, such as where there are not enough attorneys willing to serve or available to serve on the court appointed list. Ms. Geiger believes he understands the need and the cost efficiency of some of our offices, but he is a believer it would be just as cost efficient to use the private bar, and that they do a good job.

Ms. Geiger believes Senator McDougle would be supportive of some of the proposed changes to the Discovery Rule. He said he recognizes that in some areas no matter what you do you just do not get the discovery. He did recommend that we talk to some other legislators on that.

The last topic we discussed was the Appellate Defender Office. Ms. Geiger explained to Senator McDougle that the Appellate office cost about \$600,000 and handled about ten percent of our appeals. In order to cover the entire state it would be millions of dollars so that ended that idea.

We know that we basically have an uphill battle but we know where he is coming from on that and we know we have to do a pretty sincere review of the capital offices and their workload.

There was discussion regarding the efficiencies of the public defender offices.

Judge Rosenblatt said that the point of all of this was to inform the Commission of all of the challenges we are going to have in the General Assembly. Senator McDougle practices in the areas where we have never been able to make any headway at all. There is a lot of opposition. He said that the battle of getting the \$500,000 down to \$200,000 was epic, and the good news is that Ms. Geiger knows her way around the General Assembly and is doing a good job for us.

Ms. Geiger said that in preparation for the 2014 General Assembly Session she will try to provide the Commission with any draft legislative proposals during the September meeting so that the Commission can decide if there are legislative bills they want to have introduced.

There are a couple of ideas based on court opinions that have come out for possible bills. We would like to try to get those started earlier so we can find patrons and get them drafted as pre-filed bills. Pre-filed bills do not count toward the limited number of bills for the General Assembly members. Getting started ahead of time hopefully will get us a better result.

Judge Hanson moved that the Virginia Indigent Defense Commission convene in closed session to discuss personnel issues pursuant to the personnel exemption contained in §2.2-3711(A) (1) of the Code of Virginia.

This meeting will be attended only by members of the Commission, however, pursuant to §2.2-3712 (F) of the Code of Virginia, the Commission also requests the attendance of the Executive Director and the Deputy Director because it is reasonable to believe that their presence will aid the Commission in its consideration of the matters which are the subject of the closed session.

Ms. Jankowski seconded the motion. The motion carried.

After reconvening into open session, Judge Hanson moved for a roll-call vote asking that each member certify that to the best of his or her knowledge, during closed session, the Commission heard, discussed, or considered only public business matters that were lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements under the Freedom of Information Act.

Each member so certified.

The next item on the agenda is the training update.

Mr. Johnson said that we just finished our first of the new boot camp program. We moved from having this training once a year to twice a year. This year was transitional and it was a

larger crowd than we would like to have in the future. By switching to twice a year it will be a smaller group of new hires, which will help us do more hands-on training.

We will be doing this training in May and December which should coincide with most of our hiring cycle.

In the past, the focus of boot camp was on jury trials. We asked the Public Defenders what they would like their new attorneys to focus on, and jury trials were not on the list. There is so much information they need to know first. The first two sessions were on professionalism and client-centered communication. We did mock client interviews. The third day was appeal day. We talked about how to preserve issues for appellate review, how to make objections, did a workshop on preservation of objections, appellate procedure, on writing petitions, and on oral advocacy. The following day we had a workshop on drafting assignments of error because it is a hot issue with the courts. Our sense was that we want our attorneys to understand the importance of appellate practice right out of the box.

The reviews were great. The best reviews we have had. We will be doing it again in December with a few tweaks. It was a lot of work putting together a new program but we hope moving forward it won't be as labor intensive. It was a big success and a lot of people here worked very hard on it.

We have wanted to redo the certification training because it is rather dated. We put together a committee. Many of the committee members recently went through the certification training and spent the last several months working on this. All of the sessions have been recorded and are now being edited. The last page in the meeting materials shows Day 1 and Day 2 of the certification training.

The certification training is pretty basic and is meant to be basic. Many of the attorneys we have here are experienced practitioners and do not do a lot of criminal work but they are using the certification training to recertify, which is really not designed for them because it is basic training, but because it is free, we are seeing people come here to get six to ten hours of no cost CLE's. This revised training is very clearly designed for out of the box attorneys.

Our hope, when we get caught up, is to start recording more training targeted to the private bar and host free trainings for the private bar to recertify. The big issue is getting juvenile hours. Four hours of juvenile training are required every two years. There is not a lot of juvenile training available. There is the Juvenile Law and Education conference but if people miss that, they are out of luck.

With our annual conference we are going to have two hours of juvenile training every year. We will have four hours of fresh juvenile training and host that here.

There was discussion regarding the certification training held here every month.

Our Annual Conference this year will be September 11th and 12th at the Crowne Plaza in Hampton. We are going to have two plenary sessions and fifteen breakout sessions. We will have a final agenda in the next couple weeks. We are trying to use attorneys within our

system where ever possible because we have a lot of expertise with the system. It sends a good message to the younger attorneys to see people that have been in the system are the folks instructing on it.

There was discussion regarding the annual conference.

The only other training we will have to finish out the calendar year is the Office Manager training on November 5th and 6th. We had two new Office Managers hired this month and had them here last week for a day of training. We started doing this when we have a new Office Manager. We bring them here to meet everyone and train for one day to make sure they understand what we need from them. Mr. Johnson heard from the Public Defenders in those offices and both Office Managers were pleased with the hands on training and attention they received.

That takes us through the end of the year and then next March we will have the Management training. For two years now we have included the senior assistants and deputies. And that has been well received.

Training is busy but Mr. Johnson is very pleased with the quality improvements we have made in the last year and a half.

There was no further business.

Ms. Jankowski made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Lett seconded the motion. The motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 12:50 pm.

Respectfully Submitted:

Approved By:

Diane Z. Pearson, Administrative Assistant

David J. Johnson, Executive Director